

less than 51,735 persons spoke English, but only 490 of them had it as their mother tongue. (Among the rest one might also include the Hungarian-American immigrants, who came back to Hungary later.) At the same time 2,664 persons spoke Russian as their mother tongue, and 12,324 more as a secondary language. Since the census here do not specify Ruthenians, the question as to who were the fifteen-thousand Russians in 1941 Hungary remains unanswered. Four-fifths of them were men. In Budapest there lived 13 speakers of Albanian, 121 speakers of Arabic, 84 of Danish, 45 of Esthonian, 99 of Finnish, 298 of Flemish and 1,159 of Netherlandish (= Dutch), 37 of Japanese, 33 of Chinese, 35 of Latvian, 34 of Malay, 69 of Armenian, 33 of Persian, 204 of Portuguese, 1,296 of Spanish, 242 of Swedish, 626 Turkish, etc. Because in 1941 the (by now) outer districts of Budapest were independent communities, the same data is available about them too. Thus we read that in Csepel 14 people spoke Dutch and 27 spoke Turkish. Because the data is also specified to sex, further striking features are easy to find.

In general the book (and the whole series) is one of the most reliable and important source works in modern Hungary.

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem,
Budapest

Vilmos Voigt

Nagy Károly

Magyar szigetvilágban ma és holnap

New York, Püski, 1984, 159 pp.

Károly Nagy, a professor of psychology and sociology at Middlesex County College, is known as a spokesman of Hungarian national self-awareness in the Western hemisphere. In 1956 he left his native country for political reasons, but he started to make a *rapprochement* with the Hungarian state much earlier than most members of his generation.

This book is a collection of essays, talks and interviews written with the explicit purpose of making Hungarians aware of their common heritage, irrespective of the different political and social circumstances under which they happen to live. For their author the revival of one's national traditions figure as a human duty rather than merely a virtue. Such an attitude may suggest a view of culture which some would regard as conservative at the end of the 20th century, but it can nonetheless do a great service to a community which is kept together by a language, while its members are scattered in the most remote parts of the world.

Károly Nagy's basic hypothesis is that since World War II politicians have largely overstated the cultural differences between Hungarians living abroad and those living in their own country. This may be so, despite the fact that occasionally Nagy seems to be prone to the temptation of excessive optimism. Speaking of 16 million Hungarians, he tends to consider language as the basis of national identity. Far from questioning the relevance of a mother tongue, I would prefer an analysis of national identity less restricted to linguistic factors. The history of Hungary, a small country often menaced and sometimes even occupied by the great powers, is beset with peculiar difficulties, and because of the great influence changing historical conditions have exerted upon the fate of the country, terms like Hungarian self-image, identity, or even nationalism may admit of different interpretations. All theoreticians of that identity select those facts which accord best with their own idea of Hungarian characteristics, and in this the present author is no exception. The idea underlying his view of Hungarian self-assessment is that national culture largely depends upon the unwritten legacy of the peasantry. Such a conception of "organic culture," inherited from the Romantics and represented by the Populist writers, musicians, visual artists, and social anthropologists of the 1930's has made a tremendous impact on the Hungarian self-image, but sometimes its advocates have failed to do

justice to the alternative tradition of bourgeois Liberalism, a trend which has been equally influential from the late 18th century to the present age.

Having observed that Nagy has a somewhat narrow view of national traditions, I must admit that his attitude *vis-à-vis* present-day Hungary is exceptionally objective. Although he blames the Hungarian authorities for their reluctance to make Hungarian books and periodicals published in the West accessible in Hungary, he is no less critical of Western Hungarians who would have no cultural, institutional, or even personal relations with the Hungarian state. It would not only be idle but also unjust to expect a whole-hearted acceptance of the political aims of present-day Hungary, but it is somewhat surprising that in some cases Nagy fails to consider important writers whose work would support his own position. When admitting that Western youth organizations associate patriotism with religious education, he could refer to Pilinszky, whose work (available in the translation of no lesser poet than Ted Hughes) has been acclaimed in several Western countries as a significant contribution to religious writing in the 20th century. To mention another example, Nagy makes an important point when emphasizing the achievement of Western Hungarian writers, but it is hardly understandable that he never even mentions Márai, a U.S. citizen and unquestionably the most influential Hungarian writer who has worked abroad since the late 1940s.

The significance of these two examples should not be overstressed. My intention is no more than to suggest that the initiative taken by Károly Nagy, a man of exceptional moral integrity, whose pioneering activity may prove to be of lasting value for future generations, could be followed by a broadening of horizons. Given the fact that Hungarians living in the West differ in their religion and even in their cultural background and ideology, there may be more chance for the survival of their national self-awareness if the complex variety of Hungarian traditions, and the wide scale of cultural values is stressed by those who insist upon the relevance of national identity.

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem,
Budapest

Mihály Szegedy-Maszák

**Hommage à la terre natale — Tisztelet a szülőföldnek. Külföldön élő magyar származású
művészek II. kiállítása**

1982. december 17–1983. január 30

Műcsarnok, Budapest, Hősök tere, pp. 176

As Béla Köpeczi, Minister of Culture and Education says in his introduction to the volume, the art exhibition in Budapest, to which this book was the catalogue, was set up by living artists of Hungarian origin from outside of Hungary. More than 250 artists participated in the exhibition, and their short biographies are included in the volume, together with a list of their exhibited works, and one illustration by each artist. Thus the book stands as the only handbook of Hungarian artists abroad, and we should welcome a similar, but detailed publication, also giving more biographical data about the artists. Perhaps "*Living artists of Hungarian origin abroad*" should be the proper title of such a handbook. However, we should mention that the book (and the exhibition) did not cover Hungarian artists not permanently living abroad, nor did it include Hungarian artists from Czechoslovakia, Rumania, the Soviet Union or Yugoslavia. They should also be included in the coming exhibitions and publications. Similar publications of Hungarian writers living abroad are already available.

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem,
Budapest

Vilmos Voigt